



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/073,668	02/08/2002	Heinrich Englert	P6608.0US	4591
30008	7590	01/14/2004		
GUDRUN E. HUCKETT LONSSTR. 53 WUPPERTAL, 42289 GERMANY			EXAMINER GOODMAN, CHARLES	
			ART UNIT 3724	PAPER NUMBER
DATE MAILED: 01/14/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/073,668

Applicant(s)

ENGLERT ET AL.

Examiner

Charles Goodman

Art Unit

3724

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 November 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_. 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. The Amendment filed on 11/6/03 has been entered.
2. The drawings were received on 11/6/03. These drawings are disapproved since the specific design of the at least two jointing members and the arrangement thereof (new Fig. 7) is not supported by the disclosure as originally filed and therefore deemed to be new matter. The other corrected drawings would be approved if filed separately.

### ***Drawings***

3. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the arrangement with at least two jointing stone members (claims 6-7) must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claims 6-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Art Unit: 3724

- i. Claim 6 is vague and indefinite in that it is not clear what the claim encompasses. Where is this shown in the drawings? What is the scope of the claim since such may not be ascertained without a corresponding showing in the drawings? Moreover, what is the claim referring to when claim 1 sets forth that the length of the stone is greater than the cutting edge? How is it possible or defined such that two stone members would comply with the requirements of claim 1?

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1, 2, and 4-8<sup>1</sup> are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Theien in view of Englert (DE 39 27 230).

Theien discloses the invention substantially as claimed including, *inter alia*, at least one straight jointing stone (e.g. 40, 140) having an active jointing area that is longer than a length of the cutting edge (note Figs. 4 and 6). However, Theien lacks the step of performing at least one relative stroke. In that regard, Theien already teaches that it is known in the jointing art to perform at least one stroke in the longitudinal

---

<sup>1</sup> Regarding claims 6-7, since there is no proper support for these features in the drawings and that the scope of the claims are thus unascertainable, they have been rejected herein. However, if somehow this

Art Unit: 3724

direction of the cutting edge. See c. 3, ll. 24-38. Moreover, Englert teaches, as per Applicant's description of this prior art in conjunction with the depiction of Figs. 1-2 of the same, an example of jointing wherein the jointing device performs at least one relative stroke between the jointing stone (13) and the inherent cutting edge (not clearly shown in the Figures) wherein the stroke length is inherently shorter than the length of the cutting edge due to the stroke length limits between the members (5, 6) and that the length of the inherent cutting edge must be as long as the length between members (5, 6) if not longer. The teachings of both Theien and Englert suggests that such a relative stroke movement allows for more even wear of the jointing stone (and therefore longer service life for the same) during the jointing operation because more of the jointing area would be used by this process. Furthermore, the stroking action provides better grinding motion between the jointing stone and the cutting edge since the grinding is not limited to one direction. Thus, it would have been obvious to the ordinary artisan at the time of the instant invention to provide the method of Theien with the relative stroke as taught and suggested by Theien and Englert combined in order to facilitate more even wear of the jointing stone during the jointing operation.

Regarding claim 2, it appears that the modified method of Theien includes this feature. However, if it is argued otherwise, then it would have been obvious to the ordinary artisan at the time of the instant invention to provide the modified method of Theien with the length of the jointing stone as claimed in order to facilitate optimum use of the jointing area, since due to the length relationship between the jointing stone and

Art Unit: 3724

the cutting edge in Theien, a longer stroke length than that claimed would be unnecessary,<sup>2</sup> and since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233. Substantially the same reasoning applies to claim 8 in that due to the length relationship as taught by Theien, it is obvious that the stroke length would be multiple times shorter than the length of the cutting edge.

Regarding claim 4, based upon the modification above, the inherent stroke speed would be inherently multiple times smaller than the rotational speed of the rotating tool, since due to the exacting nature of jointing, a fast stroke is not advantageous for the jointing operation.

8. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Theien in view of Englert (DE 39 27 230) as applied to claims 1, 2, and 4-8 above, and further in view of Mann.

It appears that the modified method of Theien would inherently include the repetition of the stroke in the opposite direction, since it is the Examiner's opinion that this is typical of the stroking step in a jointing process. However, since the modified method of Theien is silent on this step (to the extent understood of Englert), Mann clearly teaches stroking of the jointing stone (22) with respect to the cutting edge wherein at least two strokes are performed via opposite directions which suggests that repetition of strokes will insure proper jointing characteristics. See c. 3, ll. 44-57. Thus,

---

<sup>2</sup> The jointing area of the stone already covers more than the length of the cutting edge. Therefore, a minimal stroke length is more than sufficient to provide better grinding characteristics as well as better

Art Unit: 3724

it would have been obvious to the ordinary artisan at the time of the instant invention to provide the modified method of Theien with the at least two strokes as taught by Mann in order to facilitate the proper amount of grinding for the jointing process.

### ***Response to Arguments***

9. Applicant's arguments filed 11/6/03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to Applicant's basic argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, the suggestion to combine stem from both references. The Examiner acknowledges that Theien includes profiled blades and a dressing stone with a profiled edge. However, Theien also includes a non-profiled blade (C) and a non-profiled dressing stone (140). Thus, with the additional teachings of Englert to axially move the jointing stone relative to the blade would have been obvious for the reasons stating in the rejection supra.

Regarding Applicant's arguments with respect to using the stroke for a longer length jointing stone, the fact that a smaller stone is stroked relative to the blade (Englert) teach or suggest to the ordinary artisan that the same type of stroke may be

---

wear.

Art Unit: 3724

used for a longer length stone (e.g. as in Theien), since the problems that Applicant notes, e.g. potential nicks, is obviated by the longer length covering more of the area of the blade jointing region. In other words, axial movement of the jointing stone of longer length prevents localization of the grinding area. It should be noted that it is Theien's (longer length jointing stone) primary method of jointing that is being modified by the teachings of Englert rather than the reverse as Applicant appears to argue.

### ***Conclusion***

10. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Charles Goodman whose telephone number is (703) 308-0501. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday between 7:30 AM to 6:00 PM EST.



Application/Control Number: 10/073,668

Page 8

Art Unit: 3724

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Allan Shoap, can be reached on (703) 308-1082.

In lieu of mailing, it is encouraged that all formal responses be faxed to (703) 872-9306. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1148.

cg

January 12, 2004



**Charles Goodman**  
**Primary Examiner**  
**AU 3724**

CHARLES GOODMAN  
PRIMARY EXAMINER